

Table 3. Brands Where TITL #33 Tar Results are
Lower than PM Advertised Results (mg/cigt.)

	QA 1990 Year Average	Specification Tar	Philip Morris Advertised Tar ¹	TITL Market Sample #32 ²	TITL Market Sample #33 ³	TITL Market Sample #33 Rounded Values
Alpine Lights 80 Men. (Box)	9.9	10.0	10	10	9.0	9
Benson & Hedges 100	16.5	16.0	17	17	15.7	16
Benson & Hedges 100 Menthol	16.0	16.0	16	16	15.4	15
Benson & Hedges Lights 100	10.9	10.5	11	11	10.4	10
Benson & Hedges Lights Men. 100	11.1	10.5	11	11	9.9	10
Benson & Hedges DeLuxe Ultra Lights Menthol 100 (Box)	5.9	6.0	5	5	4.4	4
Cambridge Lights Menthol 100	12.1	12.0	12	12	11.2	11
Cartier 100 10's 85 (Box)	8.7	9.0	N.L.	9	8.1	8
Cartier 100 20's (Box)	9.2	9.0	9	9	8.3	8
Cartier 100 20's Men. (Box)	9.5	9.0	9	9	8.4	8
Cartier 100 10's Men. (Box)	9.2	9.0	N.L.	9	8.4	8
Commander 70 (NF)	20.4	19.0	24	24	21.8	22
Marlboro 80 (Box)	16.2	16.0	17	17	15.7	16
Marlboro 85	16.2	16.0	17	17	15.8	16
Marlboro 85 25's	16.1*	16.0	17	17	15.8	16
Marlboro Lights 85 (Box)	11.0	11.0	11	11	10.5	10
Marlboro Lights 100	10.8	11.0	11	11	10.1	10
Marlboro Lights 100 (Box)	10.9	11.0	11	11	10.0	10
Marlboro 100 (Box)	16.1	16.0	17	17	15.8	16
Marlboro Lights Men. 85 (Box)	10.0	10.0	10	10	9.3	9
Marlboro Lights Men. 100 (Box)	10.2	10.0	10	10	9.3	9

Table 3. (cont.)

	QA 1990 Year Average	Specification Tar	Philip Morris Advertised Tar ¹	TITL Market Sample #32 ²	TITL Market Sample #33 ³	TITL Market Sample #33 Rounded Values
Marlboro Ultra Lights 85 (Red Box)	5.7	6.0	6	N.L.	5.4	5
Marlboro Ultra Lights 85 (Silver Box)	5.3	6.0	6	N.L.	5.3	5
Merit Ultra Lights 85	5.0	5.0	5	5	4.2	4
Merit Ultra Lights 85 (Box)	4.8	5.0	5	5	4.5	4
Merit 85 (Box)	7.9	8.0	8	8	7.3	7
Merit 85	7.7	8.0	8	8	7.4	7
Merit 100	10.0	10.0	10	10	9.1	9
Merit Menthol 100	10.1	10.0	10	10	9.3	9
Merit De-Nic Low Tar 85	8.7*	**	9	9	8.1	8
Merit De-Nic Low Tar Men. 85	9.1*	9.0	9	9	7.7	8
Merit De-Nic Ultra Low Tar 85	3.6*	**	N.L.	4	3.3	3
Merit De-Nic Ultra Low Tar Men. 85	3.6*	**	N.L.	4	3.0	3
Next De-Nic Low Tar 85	9.2	9.0	9	9	8.0	8
Next De-Nic Low Tar Menthol 85	9.4	9.0	9	9	7.5	7
Next De-Nic Ultra Low Tar 85	4.0*	4.0	N.L.	4	3.5	3
Next De-Nic Ultra Low Tar Men. 85	3.4*	4.0	N.L.	4	3.2	3
Next De-Nic Ultra Low Tar 100	5.1*	6.0	N.L.	6	5.0	5
Next De-Nic Ultra Low Tar Menthol 100	5.5*	6.0	N.L.	6	4.5	4
Parliament Lights 80 (Box)	8.9	9.0	9	9	8.4	8
Players 85 (Box)	11.9	12.0	12	12	11.4	11
Players 85 Menthol (Box)	11.4	12.0	12	12	11.2	11
Players 100 (Box)	13.9	14.0	14	14	13.4	13
Players Lights 100 25's	11.9	12.0	12	12	11.0	11
Players Lights 100 Menthol 25's	12.2	12.0	11	12	10.8	11
Saratoga 120 Menthol (Box)	14.4	14.5	15	15	13.8	14
Virginia Slims 100	14.6	14.5	15	15	14.3	14
Virginia Slims Menthol 100	14.8	14.5	15	15	14.4	14

Table 3. (cont.)

	QA 1990 <u>Year Average</u>	Specification <u>Tar</u>	Philip Morris <u>Advertised Tar</u> ¹	TITL Market <u>Sample #32</u> ²	TITL Market <u>Sample #33</u> ³	TITL Market Sample #33 <u>Rounded Values</u>
Virginia Slims Lights 100 (Box)	8.9	9.0	9	9	8.2	8
Virginia Slims Lights 100 Men. (Box)	8.8	9.0	9	9	7.6	8
Virginia Slims Lights 120 (Box)	14.0	14.0	14	14	13.4	13
Virginia Slims Lights 120 Men. (Box)	13.9	14.0	14	14	13.3	13
Virginia Slims Superslims Menthol 100 (Box)	5.8	6.0	6	6	5.3	5

¹ Purcell, Clare, "Tar and Nicotine Numbers," memo to Distribution, August 23, 1990.

² Steele, William L., letter to William F. Kuhn, March 13, 1991.

³ Stooler, William L., letter to William F. Kuhn, March 11, 1991.

*Cigarette Testing Services data

**No record of tar specification in 1990.

N.L. = Not Listed